

REMARKS
SUMMARY

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-17, and 19-21 are pending. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 9 and 19-21 have been amended to correct claim dependencies resulting from cancellation of claims 7 and 18.

Claims 11-21 have been objected to. Claims 1-6 and 11-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Houston et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0074695 (“Houston”). Claims 7, 9, and 18-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Houston*.

APPLICANTS’ RESPONSE

In this Response, Applicants present arguments concerning the patentability of claims 1-6, 9, 11-17, and 19-21 to address the Examiner’s rejections. Applicants’ silence with regard to any aspect of the Examiner’s rejections of the dependent claims constitutes recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on Applicants’ remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claim 11 to correct a minor typographical error. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-21.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the features “a plurality of data records, wherein each of the data records includes an outlet name, an organization name, and a parent name” (from claim 7) and “receiving data describing at least one of the plurality of outlets,

PATENT

wherein the data describing each of the at least one of the plurality of outlets includes an outlet name, an organization name, and a parent name” (from claim 18), respectively.

The Examiner alleged that claims 7 and 18 were unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Houston*. Office Action dated May 27, 2008 (“Office Action”), § 18. The Examiner conceded that *Houston* does not describe the above features. *Office Action*, § 19. The Examiner alleged that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an additional storage unit, comprising user information containing an outlet name, an organization name, and a parent name” *Office Action*, § 20.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 11, and likewise their dependent claims 2-6 and 9 and 12-17 and 19-21, respectively, are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by *Houston*.

The present application and *Houston* were, at the time the claimed subject matter of the present application was made, owned by IMS Software Services LTD. *Houston* is therefore disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections to claims 1-6 and 11-17.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

At least because claims 9 and 9-21 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, claims 9 and 19-21 are allowable. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections thereto.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of which are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (212) 408-2517 if any additional information or assistance is required.

Applicants believe that no additional fee is due other than the fee for the two-month extension in connection with the filing of this response. If any additional fee is due, or overpayment made, with regard to this response, Applicants authorize the Director to charge any such fee, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: 

Paul Ragusa
Patent Office Reg. No. 38,587

Jack L. Chen
Patent Registration No. 48,634

30 Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10112-4498
(212) 408-2500

Attorneys for Applicant(s)